



PRELIMINARY NOTES
NW TRANSMISSION ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (NTAC)

November 4, 2003, 9:00 AM-3:30 PM
Portland, OR – PDX Airport Conference Center

Introductions, Arrangements, and Agenda Changes

Chris Reese, Puget Sound Energy (PSE), NTAC Chair, presided over the meeting. He introduced the meeting with a quote: “Beyond the Alps lies Italy” – Titus Livius. The Agenda is Attachment 1. The attendance list is Attachment 2.

Meeting Notes – October 1, 2003

There were no changes to the Notes as e-mailed.

Marv Landauer noted that SSG-WI filed its report with FERC on Friday, October 31. The report is available at ssg-wi.com.

Review Draft Scope of Work

Lon Peters and Natalie McIntire edited the document and released the revised document on October 13 (e-mailed with the announcement for this meeting and available from NWPP website). There were only minor edits to the document since the last meeting. The document still contains several place holders, but Lon points out that NTAC will have to deal with those as they are beyond the scope of editing. Chris declared the document “frozen” for now. If anyone has serious problems with the document, he or she should advise the group via e-mail.

Expected Products from NTAC

Lon Peters created this document (Attachment 3) because he thought it would be good to add more specifics on end products. The only response he received was from Mark Stauffer. The document as discussed in the meeting did not reflect Mark’s comments, which were mostly dealing with the order of items listed. Lon hopes NTAC can get started on those products that are near the top of the list. Lon explained his thoughts on the items listed. NTAC made some changes to the document and discussed the differences between items 3, 4, and 5 (compilation of, assessment of, and scenario analysis of the existing system). There was general agreement that NTAC would not duplicate any products that are now out there (eg WECC Loads & Resources tabulations) but would use existing products to the extent they meet NTAC’s needs. Some other concerns arose having to do with open season concepts, generic resources vs known resources, and utility plans as compared to developer plans. NTAC decided to forego editing the document during the meeting. Instead, members with concerns are encouraged to forward those concerns to Lon and he will incorporate them into another draft.

Non-Construction Alternatives

Terry Oliver's, BPA, presentation is Attachment 4. Terry described how new technologies are impacting the demand for electricity – each in an unpredictable manner. Smart Grid technologies may passively help system stability (eg water heaters that shut down when the system frequency drops.) Now, additional information may be found at the climate solutions website (climatesolutions.org.) Look for a report entitled “Poised for Profit”. The BPA transmission website (transmission.bpa.gov) also has much information available. Click on the link for Non-Construction Round Table.

Planning System Test

Scott Waples walked through the examples in his testing document (previously distributed via e-mail). He referred to the Planning Process Flow Chart and Explanations (Attachments 5 and 6). In preparing his tests of the process, Scott drew from his experiences with the West of Hatwai project. During the discussions, it appeared that some additional boxes may be needed on the Flow Chart. Questions arose about the relationship of NTAC to TPC and of which organization was responsible for various pieces of work. Jerry Rust, NWPP President, reminded those present that TPC voted to expand its scope and NTAC is a result of that expanded scope. NTAC is part of TPC. Scott sensed that his perspective is not in line with the desires of the rest of the group and elected to defer further discussion of his tests. He will take another cut at it.

Mike Kriepe raised questions about whether the NTAC process should replace the queue process already in place in the utilities. Lon Peters says we should be looking to develop a better process.

There were also concerns with nature of the analyses to be done. Several felt that economic analysis does not provide enough information; technical analysis is also needed. Box 16 (in the Flow Chart which is labeled “Evaluate alternative solutions to constraints”) is the economic analysis while Box 12 (“Identify Trans. Alts. and costs.”) is the more technical. Chris asked that a small group form and sort out these issues. Wally Gibson will head the group. Other members are Scott Waples, Lon Peters, Gordon Dobson-Mack, and possibly Bill Pascoe. The group is to clarify boundaries (eg between TPC and NTAC), map out a transition from existing processes to the new (NTAC) process, and determine how much analysis is enough.

Planning Process Flow Chart

Marv Landauer said the Flow Chart is slightly revised since last meeting. Discussion mostly dwelt on the differences from and relationship of NTAC to the SSG-WI process.

Assessment of Existing System – Survey of Tools

Ron Schellberg displayed a summary of his survey of various models that are available to help NTAC accomplish its work (see Attachment 7). He left MAPS and COUGER off of the list. Ron did not know how well each of the models actually performed. He would like to talk with anyone having experience with any of the models. There is also a question regarding who would run the studies with the model once one was selected. CAISO has some experience with PLEXOS.

Collection of Initial Data

Committed Resources

Lon Peters talked about conclusions reached by the small group working on Committed Resources (document previously distributed). The small group found no easy answer as to how to define whether resources are committed or not. They concluded that they could avoid the issue by defining the analysis somewhat differently. Lon will clean up the wording in his document. Jerry Rust suggested using WECC Planned Generation Additions as a reasonable input.

Committed Transmission

John Philips discussed his thoughts on this issue (handout previously distributed.)

Known Constraints and Problems

Marv Landauer displayed a diagram (Attachment 8) of known constraints that was developed early in the RTO discussions.

Gordon Dobson-Mack offered a different perspective of constraints – that from an operations standpoint. He showed some graphs that illustrate how constraints can occur during operations and affect the capability of the Northern Intertie. Chris Reese notes that planners tend to focus on the next increment and might overlook ways to firm up the underlying base capacity. Gordon suggests that small groups be formed as needed to study operational constraints. He sees the problem in two phases. The first is to identify the engineering solution. The second is to identify who pays. (NTAC scope does not include the latter.)

Chris Reese asked that a small group be formed to look at how aggressively NTAC will address the issues raised in Box (Diamond) 6 on the Flow Chart (“TPC verification of adequacy of overall system to meet base year loads”). He asked Marv Landauer to present a report on this issue at the next TPC meeting (scheduled for January 29 in Portland, OR). The assessment of the overall system is such a critical starting point for NTAC analysis, Chris Reese will ask the TPC to complete the system assessment early next year.

Work Products and Timeline

Marv Landauer suggested that NTAC proceed with a basic study this year and not worry about full TPC assessment. Several others suggested that NTAC could start with the paths identified by SSG-WI as possible transmission upgrades. A small task team was formed to develop a proposal for next year’s work products and timeline for completing those products. Lon Peters (lead), Mark Stauffer, Bill Pascoe, and Gordon Dobson-Mack are on the team.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be Tuesday, November 25, 2003 from 8:30-3:30 at the Portland Airport Conference Center.